

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, 12, 17, 18 and 23 have been amended. Claims 1-23 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 102(b) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-18 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ng (U.S. Patent 6,411,956). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In regard to claim 1, Ng does not teach *an application server that comprises: an application configured to initiate requests for connections with a plurality of distinct data resources; a plurality of data sources configured to provide connections with the plurality of distinct data resources; and wherein the application server is configured to associate an identity with each of the plurality of data sources and to use the identity to determine whether one of the plurality of data sources provides connections to the same data resource as another of the plurality of data sources, wherein each identity is unique to one of the plurality of distinct data resources, and wherein multiple ones of the data sources have the same identity*. Ng is directed to the problem of allowing all components working on the same transaction to request separate connections to a database even though the JDBC driver for the database requires that each connection with the database represents a separate transaction. *See Ng, col. 3, lines 19-34.* Ng solves this problem by using multiple virtual connections but only one physical connection with the database for each transaction. *See Ng, col. 4, lines 1-41.* The situation in Ng is described in regard to connections to a single database, as opposed to a plurality of distinct data resources as recited in Applicants' claim 1. Also, Ng does not describe a plurality of data sources configured to provide connections with the plurality of distinct data resources. Ng describes only a single source for connections.

Furthermore, Ng does not associate an identity with each of the plurality of data sources and to use the identity to determine whether one of the plurality of data sources provides connections to the same data resource as another of the plurality of data sources, wherein each identity is unique to one of the plurality of distinct data resources, and wherein multiple ones of the data sources have the same identity, as recited in claim 1. Ng's table 60 and col. 4, lines 1-10 cited by the Examiner describe that "table 60 is maintained which associates a global transaction identifier with a physical connection to the database." (emphasis added). The table 60 in Ng simply shows which single physical connection is associated with which transaction. The only identifier in Ng is a global transaction identifier which identifies distinct transactions, not distinct data resources. The transaction identifier and table 60 in Ng have absolutely nothing to do with associating an identity with each of a plurality of data sources and to use the identity to determine whether one of the plurality of data sources provides connections to the same data resource as another of the plurality of data sources, wherein each identity is unique to one of the plurality of distinct data resources, and wherein multiple ones of the data sources have the same identity, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Ng clearly does not teach or suggest the limitations of Applicants' claim 1.

In regard to claim 12, Ng does not teach ascertaining an identity of a data source associated with the request, wherein the data source is configured to provide the connection to one of a plurality of distinct data resources, and wherein said identity is unique to said one of said plurality of distinct data resources; and comparing said identity with respective identities of multiple data sources with existing connections, wherein the identity of each of the multiple data sources is unique to a specific one of said plurality of distinct data resources. As discussed above, the situation in Ng is described in regard to connections to a single database, as opposed to a plurality of distinct data resources. Also, Ng does not describe a plurality of data sources configured to provide connections with the plurality of distinct data resources. Ng describes only a single source for connections. Moreover, the table 60 in Ng simply shows which single physical

connection is associated with which transaction. The only identifier in Ng is a global transaction identifier which identifies distinct transactions, not distinct data resources. The transaction identifier and table 60 in Ng have absolutely nothing to do with ascertaining an identity of a data source associated with the request, wherein the data source is configured to provide the connection to one of a plurality of distinct data resources, and wherein said identity is unique to said one of said plurality of distinct data resources; and comparing said identity with respective identities of multiple data sources with existing connections, wherein the identity of each of the multiple data sources is unique to a specific one of said plurality of distinct data resources.

Similar arguments apply in regard to independent claims 17, 18 and 23.

Applicants also assert that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

Section 103(a) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ng in view of Yousefi'zadeh (U.S. Publication 2004/0030739). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons given above in regard to the independent claims.

Applicants also assert that numerous ones of these claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejections have been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-14900/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: March 28, 2008